ತಾವು ಕನ್‌ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಹಕ್ಕು ಭಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ತಾವು ಕನ್‌ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರಿ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಗಾವಿಯವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದು ಹೋಗಲೇ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಹೋಗಲೇ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಗಾವಿಯವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಮೊದಲೇ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಈ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಮತ್ತು ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ಸ್ ನೋಡಿ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದು ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ತಾವು ಕನ್‌ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ರೆಫರ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸನ್ನು ಈ ದಿವಸವೇ ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Bangalore, Karnataka and Mysore Universities Bill, 1969

Motion to consider—(Debate continued)

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH (Nanjangud). Mr. Speaker, resuming what I have stated yesterday, I shall not take much time of the House except adding a few comments here and there.

The object with which the Government is thinking of bringing this amendment, amending section 11, appears to me that there is something more behind it than what appears. The facts are there which indicate that in the Bangalore University for sometime the Vice-Chancellor was absent and somebody was put as officiating Vice-Chancellor. The Government must have, perhaps, smelt a small rat. There is positive evidence to show that the Government is hesitating to probe into the matter. During that interregnum a charge is levelled that about 4 appointments in the Engineering College, 8 appointments in the Central College and 8 appointments in the administration, were proposed. It is one of the specific charges that during this interregnum a grand plan was formed to foist these appointments in the university to the best of their ability and ground was laid to fill these places with persons who are close relatives. Naturally rumours started in the university campus and had its effect in the impressionable minds of the students which are already distrurbed. This information has come to them as a bolt from the blue.

3-30 P.M.

I had an opporutnity to bring to the notice of the Government and the concerned authority, especially the Ministry, the need to probe into

(SRI L. SRIKANTAIAH)

this in a dispassionate manner whether this period of interregnum was not utilised by whoever he may be when he was occupying that post to mis-utilise that power and authority. Normally I go to the Bar Association to take my food and I have to go in front of the University College to reach the Bangalore Bar Association and I can closely hear what the students are talking about. Probably, in order to overcome the difficulty the Government has now opened its eyes to fill up what is called the temporary vacancy by amending section 11 of the Bangalore University Act. I am glad that at least now Government has come forward with a measure to amend this provision. It is high time that Government opened its eyes and took a dispassionate view. After all, there cannot be smoke without fire; somewhere there is fire. If we start with a pre-disposition, "I know Mr. X since his boyhood and he is not capable of it", I would rather caution that all that looks white is not milk.

In this connection, though it does not concern this aspect of the Bangalore University Act, I think it is my duty at this juncture to draw the attention of the Minister of Cabinet rank to what is happening in the University because the Government is also thinking of bringing many more amendments. I would like to read an excerpt from an article which has appealed to me and probably the writer has summarised the whole position of the Indian Universities in a lucid manner giving a gist of what I wanted to say. When my private Bill comes up I will give more details as to what exactly is happening there. The article has opened with the caption "Academic Colonialism : Native Style". We have heard of marriages of Italian style and French style. Here is an interesting article which opens with the caption "Academic Colonialism : Native Style". This article has appeard in 'Mainstream'.

> "But it is also important to consider another aspect of academic colonialism, namely, as it prevails within the educational organizations in the conntry.
>
> The situation in several institutes of higher learning and research is serious. The ways of workings of the educational bureaucracy in these citadels of so-called learning in India should be understood comprehensively and dealt with effectively. The Report of Public Accounts Committee of Parliament on a research institute in north India, the recent despatches in Times of India from one of its correspondents on the affairs of Allahabad and Lucknow Universities and the report of the Committee set up to go into the affairs of Banaras Hindu University a few years ago no doubt shed considerable light on the colonialism which has set in the field of educational administration. But this is not enough—the rotis getting worst. The public has to take a continuous and sustained interest in these matters and press the authorities to deal with the

indigenous version of academic colonialism. Take for instance the recruitment policy and other aspects of personnel policy of some of the educational empire-builders."

In fact, the reference to the appointments made during this interregnum has a close reflection in the article by the writer. The article further says :

"For the selection of the staff and research fellows, experts are included invariably in the selection committees. In principle, this is a right policy ; but over a period of time there has emerged a 'class' of people for whom 'being an expert' has become a profession and hence a vested interest. They are anxious to remain as 'experts' on as many selection boards as possible. Since it is the option of the education super-bosses to select them, these 'experts' become subservient to the heads of the institutions and the departmental heads. The institutions prefer these convenient 'experts' who can be managed to sing on the dotted line. Like professional mourners in the West, there are experts who are ever willing to please the authorities. Thus very often same experts are brought in for selection of candidates for all sorts of posts."

A recent judgment of our High Court in the case of one Sanskrit Professor is worth reading in this connection. It is an interesting judgment on a writ petition filed by Sri Siddappa Aradhya. The article further reads :

"A leading research institute calls the same experts for selecting various candidates be they for filling vacancies in West Asia Department or in International Politics Department or Soviet Studies and South Asian Studies and Chinese. The criteria of qualification for recruitment of candidates are so adjusted by the authorities in advance as to make sure that even the most impartial selection committees select the very candidates whom the authorities wish to prop up and reject those which they not wish to have. Sometimes the advertisements are purposely kept ambiguous. Sometimes different qualifications are stipulated for similar posts depending on the candidates to be taken. It has been seen that in one case a candidate who has a publication to his credit is rejected on the plea that these do not really reflect the eligibility of a candidate ; in other cases, the criteria of publications is so rigidly applied to the extent that even a petty article in some popular or non-descript journal is considered for the appointment".

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon. Member can go into those details when the Bill standing in his name comes up before the House.

Sri L. SRIKANTIAH.—It is enough if at least the Government have opened their eyes. I may tell the Government that hereafter this interregnum will not be tolerated. At least here is an opportunity for the Ministry of Education to probe into this matter which forms one of the students' grievances.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK (Belgaum).—Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Bangalore, Karnataka and Mysore Universities (Amendment) Bill, 1968. I know that the Bangalore University, the Karnataka University and the Mysore University are autonomous bodies, but there is no uniformity in these three University Acts even though these Universities are under the control of the Mysore Government.

I want to bring to the notice of this House the injustice has done to the Jyothi College by the Karnataka University at Belgaum. The Marathi people of Belgaum area wanted to start a college in Belgaum and so they formed a society by name Dakshin Maharashtra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal and they made an application to the Karnatak University to grant permission to start a college in Belgaum. The Karnatak University refused permission. Why? Because there are already two colleges started by the K.L.E. Society, namely, the Raja Lakhamagouda Science Institute and the Lingaraj College. More than 50 per cent of the students in those colleges are Marathi.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am told the matter is pending before the Court and it is *sub judice*.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—I know, I am an advocate; what to speak, what not to speak. I want to point out how it is doing injustice to the Marathi people. The Karnatak University refused permission to this Society to start the college. So the Dakshin Maharashtra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal made an application to the Shivaji University in Maharashtra State and the Shivaji University granted permission to the Dakshin Maharastra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal, Belgaum, to start the College at Belgaum. What harm is there if Shivaji University have given permission to start the College? So the Jyothi College was started in Belgaum in June. But the Karnatak University has brought a stay.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Since the matter is before the court, I request the Hon. Member not to go into it here. This is only an amending Bill.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—The Sivaji University granted permission, but the Karnatak University filed a case in the Civil Court, Belgaum, and obtained a stay order. The Dakshin Maharashtra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal filed an appeal against this order, but the Civil Court did not vacate the stay order. So now the Dakshin Maharashtra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal has filed a writ petition in the Supreme Court since this is a concurrent subject and because the Maharashtrians are thinking that the Mysore High Court will not give justice to them.

The Karnatak University did not give permission to start the Jyothi College because they think that if this college is started there would be a great loss to the Lingraj College and Raja Lakhmagouda College as all the Marathi boys would go to the Jyothi College. That is why they are not giving permission to the Jyothi College. This Karnatak University is a communal institution. It is a Lingayat University and it is doing injustice to the Maharashtrians. If you do not want the Maharashtrians let them go to their own state why you want to take objections for it.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—On a point of order. ಈಗ ನಥೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವಂತಹ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಬಗ್ಗೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವುದೋ ಸೂಚ್ ಫೈರ್ ಆದ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು, ಅಡ್ಮಿಷನ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರೂಲ್ 292ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರು ಕಮ್ಯುನರ್ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತರುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಬಿರ್‌ನ ಪರಿಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I uphold the point of order raised by the Hon. Member Sri Nagappa. The Hon. Member is expected to speak on the Bill. He should not bring in any other matter.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—I know that, but I would ask the hon. Member when so many other Members were speaking here outside the purview of the Bill why were they not prevented and why are they raising points of order and trying to prevent me from speaking? Is it because I am a Maharashtrian ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already said that there is a case pending before the court and that is why you should not refer to it here.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—I know my responsibility. The Mysore Government is thinking that the Maharashtra Government is giving full support to this Jyothi College and that is why they are not giving permission for starting of this College. I am of the opinion that if the Karnatak University ought to have granted permission to the Jyothi College, the Dakshin Maharashtra Sikshan Prasarak Mandal would not have approached the Shivaji University.

Coming to the Bill, it deals with the appointments of Vice-Chancellor and other officers. That is all very good. The Vice-Chancellors are appointed by the out-siders and the experts in India. I have no objection.

As regards representation, these universities are not giving representation to the students on these bodies and that is why there is this agitation in the student world. The students are the future citizens of India and they should behave well. But if they gherao the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar, their action should be condemend not only in the public but also in the Assembly here.

With these words I thank the Chair for the time given to me.

† Sri P. B. NANDIHALI (Uchagaon).—Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I wish to express some remarks on the Bangalore, Karnatak and Mysore Universities Amendment Bill, 1968. In the first instance, I wish to bring to the kind notice of the Government about the vacancy of the Vice-Chancellor. If the vacancy of the Vice-Chancellor occurs by reason of resignation or death, temporary appointment may be made. But, I do not understand why there is a provision for temporary appointment on expiry of the term. It is not necessary at all. Such a hasty appointment of Vice-Chancellor may give scope to an aspirant who is on the look out for a post. This will be a spring-board for such a person. There is every possibility of favouritism in appointing a person to such an important post. I suggest that in such an emergency, the rights should not be vested only in the Chancellor to appoint the Vice-Chancellor, but the Senate should make the appointment in consultation with the Chancellor. They can appoint the Secretary to Government, Education Department, or the Director of Collegiate Education, who can take charge temporarily, till permanent arrangement is made under the provisions of law.

Secondly, I wish to bring to the kind notice of the Government and the House that there must be uniformity in all the University Acts in appointments, etc. At present, there is no uniformity in these three Acts. The students also are not given opportunities to represent in all these Universities. The students of one University cannot go to another University and continue their studies. There is a great need for uniformity in laws in the State. Due to lack of uniformity in the laws and syllabus, there is no discipline in the students; there is unrest, and so many agitations are going on by the student population. The Government, according to me, must take a serious note of these things. They must study the problems of the students, and they must have some policy to slove their problems. In all the bodies of the University, proper representation to the students must be given.

I welcome the provision which seems to make the Director of Public Instruction a member of the Syndicate and the Academic Council of the three Universities. The Director of Public Instruction, who is responsible for the secondary education, must necessarily have co-ordinated interest in college education.

In this connection, I wish to express my sorrowful feeling about the functioning of the Karnatak University. In Chapter II - section 4 (12) and (16) there is a provision to admit educational institutions to the privileges of the University and to withdraw such privileges, and to make special provision for the spread of university education among classes and communities which are educationally backward. Sir, I do not want to go into the merits as some of my hon. friends have brought to the notice of the Government that the case of Jyothi College is in the Court. But, I cannot but take this opportunity to express the feelings and difficulties of the Marathi people of the border area. When there is a provision in the Karnatak University Act and when

the Hon. Chief Minister and the Education Minister are here, it will be a great mistake in a democratic set-up, as a representative of the area, not to express the feelings of the people whom I represent. Sir, the Dakshina Maharashtra Sikshan Samstha had applied.....

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA (Minister for Education).—Sir, there is no meaning in discussing Jyothi College issue. The final authority of granting affiliation vests with the Government. Government had not given its opinion about affiliation of the Jyothi College; they had neither said 'yes' or 'no'. Before that it was improper for the authorities to give affiliation. After hearing from the Government, whether they are giving affiliation or not, they could have approached the Court. Without knowing the reply of the Mysore Government, they have approached the Court. This is wrong.

Sri P. B. NANDIHALI.—Sir, I thank the Hon. Minister for expressing the facts but at the same time I want to bring to his notice...

4-00 P.M.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—May I request the Hon. Minister to throw some light on the merits of the case.

Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA.—The matter is before the Court. I request the Hon. Member not to refer to it. Moreover, it has nothing to do with the Bill that is before the House.

Sri P. B. NANDIHALI.—Sir, it may not be out of the way to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister that the College authorities had fulfilled all the conditions regarding starting of the college. I also know that the University Grants Commission too visited the place and encouraged the management to start the College and after that the management approached the Government with a request to accord permission. But up to the date of the starting of the college permission was not granted. There was a function arranged for inauguration and the Union Minister accompanied by the State Minister attended the function. It would have been better for the University to bring a stay order on the said function. In the hope that Government would give permission the students were admitted into the College and now these things are going on. In fact, I do not want to go into the merits of the case. But it is my bounden duty to bring to the kind notice of the Minister concerned the inconvenience caused to the students in not granting the permission to the said college. I know the progressive policy of the Government in the educational field. Then, Sir, the Karnatak University did not say anything in the matter. I do not know how the minority people are to get protection and how their institutions could be protected which are prepared to sacrifice for the progress of this country and the State in particular. I am afraid if the Marathi people have no future here, there is every possibility that the people might agitate against the Government. Therefore, I earnestly request

(SRI P. B. NANDIHALI)

the Government to reconsider and give full protection to the minorities, not only the Marathi people in the border areas but throughout the State. The Government should treat all people equally. If in this educational field politics is to enter and the Government and the Ministers are to yield to the pressures of some local people, I fail to understand how the integrity, unity and progress of the State and the nation could be maintained in future. The youth is the sword of the nation and if they treated in this manner without even assuring certainty of their education, I do not know how the country could progress. There have been provisions in the Acts pertaining to Universities and still people are not getting the rights and facilities that are provided therein.

With these words, I thank the Chair and conclude my speech.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—I may kindly be allowed for one minute to say something on this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There are some amendments. After the amendments are moved, I will allow the member to speak.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. – ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ...

Sri V. N. PATIL.—You assured me that you are allowing me after the amendments are moved. But I want to know whether the Hon. Deputy Minister is replying to the debate. We are having 9 colleges in the Hyderabad Karnataka area. That is why it is very necessary for me to speak now only before he replies to the debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already said that I would allow him to speak out after the Minister finishes speech.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—What is the use if I speak after he finishes his reply ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Time allowed for this Bill is only one hour. I have already called upon the Hon. Deputy Minister to reply.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—He is yielding. This is a policy matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already called upon the Hon. Deputy Minister.

Sri B. B. SAYANAK.—I rise on a point of order. When the Hon. Member is given permission, how can the Hon. Chair stop him from speaking and allow the Hon. Deputy Minister to speak ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have not allowed him to speak. I have called upon the Minister to speak.

† ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾರು ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನಾಗಲೀ, ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯನ್ನಾಗಲೀ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಕಂಡು ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಬೀರಿದಂಥವು. ಅನೇಕ ಮಹತ್ತ್ವವಾದ ಹಾಗೂ ಮೂಲಭೂತವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ

ಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ನಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿಷಯ ಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬಂದಂಥ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಾಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಚಿಂಪೊರರಿ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ ಕಾರಾವಧಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟರು. ಆದರೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಸೆಳೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಛಾನ್ಸಲರ್ ಅವರು ಒಬ್ಬ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನು ಖಾಯಂ ಆಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡು ವವರೆಗೂ, ಖಾಯಂ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರೆಗೂ ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕವಾಗಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಸಂಶಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಅಸ್ಪಷ್ಟತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಕಣ್ಣು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಈಗ ಕಣ್ಣು ತೆರೆದಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಕಾಲದ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕಳೆದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದ ನಂತರ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಬಹಳ ಕಾಲದ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಮತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಲೋರಿಯಾ ಅವರು ಗತಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ತೆರವಾದ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತಾತ್ಕಾಲಿಕ ವಾಗಿ ವೈಸ್ ಛಾನ್ಸಲರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಕಾಡುಬಂದ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯ ತೊಡಕನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿ ಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೆಲವರು ಅನುಷಂಗಿಕವಾಗಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದ ರೂಪರೇಷೆ, ಅವುಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮತ್ತು ಪರ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇವೆಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಂಶ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟುದು ಎಂದು ಅನ್ನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೆಂದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು. ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಏಕರೂಪವಾದ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಇರಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ. ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ ಸ್ವಾಯತ್ತತೆ ಇರಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವೂ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ ಸ್ವಾಯತ್ತ ತೆಯ ರೂಪವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬದರಾಯಿಸಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೇಶದ ಹಾಗೂ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಅನೇಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರಲ್ಲಿ, ಶಿಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳವಾದ ಅನುಭವವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಆಡಳಿತಗಾರರಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕಾ ಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿಚಾರ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಯಾವ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲೀ, ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಕಟ್ಟಳೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವೂ ತನ್ನದೇ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪದ್ಧತಿ, ಸ್ವಾಯತ್ತವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ರೂಢಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಮೇರೆಗಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಶ್ವ ವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯವಾಗಲೀ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಾಯತ್ತತೆಯ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ ಆಡಳಿತ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಯಾ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾ ನಿಲಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರದೇ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾದ, ಸ್ವಾಯತ್ತವಾದ ಕಾಯಿದೆ, ಕಾನೂನು ಇರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯನವರು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರು, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪರಿಶ್ರಮವುಳ್ಳವರು. ಅವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಏಕರೂಪವಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯ ಗಳಿಗೂ ಇರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತರ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರು ಕೂಡ ಅದೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯವಾಗಲಿ ಅದು ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ವಾಗಿ ವರ್ತಿಸಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಬೆಳವಣಿಗೆಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಂತೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊರ ದೇಶಗಳ ತಜ್ಞರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ತನ್ನದೇ ಆದ ಕಾನೂನು, ರೂಪರೇಷೆ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವರು. ಮಾಡರ್ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಎಂದು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರಕಾರದಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದು ಮೂಲ ಭೂತವಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ಇದೆ ಅದರ ರೂಪ ರೇಷೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲೂ ರೂಪಿತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಏಕರೂಪವಾದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಗ್ರವಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಇರುವುದು ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಖರವಾಗಿ ಹೀಗೇ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಈಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೇ ಮುಂದುವರೆಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ)

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಷ್ಕರದಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದೆ; ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸರಕಾರ ಆ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದು ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದೆ, ದುರ್ಭರವಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ, ಆಡಳಿತ ಕುಸಿದುಬೀಳುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಸರಕಾರ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ ಅಷ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಶೈಕ್ಷಣಿಕ ವಿಷಯ ಅಥವಾ ಪಠ್ಯ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ ಅಥವಾ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯದ ವಿಷಯ ಮುಂತಾದ್ದು ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ತಾಳ್ಮೆ ಕೆಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಮೂಲ್ಯವಾದ ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು, ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯರ್ಥವಾದದೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಅವರು ಇಂಥ ಮುಷ್ಕರ, ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಯ ಹಾಳುಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಕಾರ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಎತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯ ಅಥವ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಆಡಳಿತದ ವಿಷಯ ಬರೀ ಮುಷ್ಕರ ಅಥವ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನದಿಂದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಚಳವಳಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವೇಳೆಯನ್ನು, ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಲಕ್ಷ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ತರುಣ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲವೇನಾದರೂ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಭೆಟ್ಟಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಸಮಾಧಾನಮಾಡಿದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ.—ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಬಂದು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಭೆಟ್ಟಿಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಿ. ಶಂಕರಗೌಡ.—ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದೆಂಬ ದುರಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ನಮಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರಿ ನಾನ್-ಆಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯೊಂದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಮುಖಂಡರನ್ನು ಭೇಟಿಮಾಡಿ ಅವರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿ ವರದಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳ ಮುಖಂಡರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಕಾಲ ಪಕ್ವವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಉದ್ರೇಕ, ಉದ್ವೇಗ ಇದೆ, ಇಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಸೆಯಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಶೀಘ್ರದಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಮಾಡದೆ ಬಿಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಹೀಗೇ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ಆದರೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವಂಥ ದೋಷವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಮೇರೆ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗೆ ಬರೆಯುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಬೇರೆ. ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸೋರ್ಸ್‌ನಿಂದ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಿ. ಶಂಕರಗೌಡ.—ಅಲಗೇಷನ್ಸ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಕೇಳಿದೆವು, ಬಂತು, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿ ಆರೋಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಧಾರವಿಲ್ಲ, ನಿಜಾಂಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ, ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಎನ್‌ಕ್ವೈರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಲ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ಸಂತೋಷ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ.—ಉಳಿದ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವುದೇ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಂಡಿಕೇಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನ್-ಆಫಿಷಿಯಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಅಕೆಡೆಮಿಕ್ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ತಜ್ಞರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯವಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಿದೆ. ಎರಡೂ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಇರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೂ ಅಳವಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಯಾವುದೇ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಅಥವ ಬೇರೆ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ವೈವಿಧ್ಯ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗದ ಮಾತು. ಈಗ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ವಾನುಮತದಿಂದ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is :

"That the Bangalore, Karnatak and Mysore Universities (Amendment) Bill, 1968 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSE 2

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There are some amendments. Sri N. A. Channe Gowda may move his amendment.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA. - I am on a point of order, Sir. According to the list of Business, we have to take up the non-official business today. I therefore request that the rest of the official business may be taken up the next day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We are in the midst of this Bill which can be finished in 10 minutes. We can take up non-official business after that.

4-30 P.M.

Sri N. A. CHANNE GOWDA (Pandavapura).—I beg to move :

"1. That in item (i), in the proposed Sub-section (7) of Section 11, at page 2, line 9, after the words: 'during the period', the words 'which shall not exceed six calendar months' shall be inserted".

"2. That in item (ii), for the proposed amendment, the following shall be substituted :

'The Secretary to Government of Mysore, Department of Health and Municipal Administration'."

"3 In item (vii), after the words 'Five teachers' the words 'at least four of them being teachers in the affiliated colleges' shall be inserted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"1. That in item (i), in the proposed Sub-section (7) of Section 11, at page 2, line 9, after the words 'during the period', the words 'which shall not exceed six calendar months' shall be inserted".

"2. That in item (ii), for the proposed amendment, the following shall be substituted:

'The Secretary to Government of Mysore, Department of Health and Municipal Administration'."

"3. In item (vii), after the words 'Five teachers' the words 'at least four of them being teachers in the affiliated colleges' shall be inserted."

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I beg to move :

"That at page 2, after the proposed sub-section (7) of Section 11, the following new sub-section shall be added :—

'8. Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (7) the appointment of Vice-Chancellor, shall be made not later than six months from the date of such vacancy'. "

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That at page 2, after the proposed sub-section (7) of Section 11, the following new sub-section shall be added:—

'8. Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (7) the appointment of Vice-Chancellor, shall be made not later than six months from the date of such vacancy'."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎ. ಚನ್ನೇಗೌಡ.—ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೂಚಿಸುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೂ ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳ ಜಾಗ ಹಂಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿ ಖಾಲಿಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹಂಗಾಮಿ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸಲವತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರ್ ರೋರಿಯರವರು ಗತಿಸಿದಾಗ ಇಂತಹ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲೇನೂ ತಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಆಶ್ರಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ಉಪಕುಲಪತಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಮುಂದುರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹಂಗಾಮಿನೇಮಕ 6 ತಿಂಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮುಂದುವರಿಯಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಇದು ಸಾಧುವಾಗಿದೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಐಟಂ ನಂಬರ್ 2ಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆನೇಟಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯೋ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಆಫ್ ಹೆಲ್ತ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸಿಕ್ಯೂಟೀವ್ ಆಫೀಸರು, ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ಪ್ರವಾಸದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಆ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಯವರು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು, ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ನೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಎಜ್ಯುಕೇಷನ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಮೂರನೆಯ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ, ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಅಫಿಷಿಯೋ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 5 ಜನ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳನ್ನು ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ. ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸೇರಿದಂತೆ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರನ್ನು ತರುವುದು ಇದೆ. ಕನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಯೆಂಟ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳು ಸೆನೇಟ್ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬರಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆಫಿಲಿಯೇಟೆಡ್ ಕಾಲೇಜುಗಳ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಸೆನೇಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಇದೆ. ಈ 3 ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಒಮ್ಮತದಿಂದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

[MR. SPEAKER In the Chair]

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, just now I have moved an amendment to Clause 2.

I think, while replying to the general debate, the Hon. Deputy Minister has stated that a date or period is fixed, during which a temporary vacancy will be continued. However, I have read that particular clause. It only says that he will continue in office till a permanent Vice-Chancellor is appointed and he resumes duty. If you read Section 11 of the original Act, we will find under sub-section (4) that :

"The Vice-Chancellor shall hold office for a term of three years and shall be eligible for reappointment."

Therefore, when the permanent Vice-Chancellor will remain in office only for a period of three years, later on another arrangement has to be made. If you read this particular amendment in the Bill, there is no time limit fixed for the temporary Vice-Chancellor. He may continue for an unlimited period till another permanent Vice-Chancellor is appointed under the Act. There is no time limit fixed for the appointment of the permanent Vice-Chancellor under the Act. Therefore, may I request the Hon. Deputy Minister to explain as to for what period this Vice-Chancellor who is going to be appointed as Temporary Vice-Chancellor under sub-section (7) of Section 11 will continue and for how many years. If the permanent Vice-Chancellor is not appointed, will he not continue for 15 years and even hundred years if he happens to live so long ? When the permanent Vice-Chancellor cannot continue for more than three years, the temporary Vice-Chancellor who is appointed by the Chancellor according to the whims and fancies of the Government, may continue for an unlimited period. When the vacancy of a Vice-Chancellor occurs, this amendment enables the Government to make a temporary arrangement and find out a suitable man. But the Government can continue this temporary Vice-Chancellor for an unlimited period. Therefore, I have suggested in my amendment the addition of a proviso that the appointment of the permanent Vice-Chancellor shall not be made not later than six months from the date of the vacancy. If this proviso is added to Section 1 (7), it becomes incumbent on the authorities to fill up the vacancy of the Vice-Chancellor within six months of its becoming vacant permanently. If this is not done, then there will be a lacuna in the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor.

As laid down in the section, a panel of names will be called for and from amongst them the Vice-Chancellor will be selected by the Chancellor. If he does not like any name, it will go and a different panel will be asked. I do not want that my amendment should be accepted but I want the Government to fix a time limit for which the temporary Vice-Chancellor should work. As it is, there is no time limit and the Chancellor may not make up his mind to appoint a permanent Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, what the Deputy Minister has stated is not correct.

Secondly what I fail to understand is, we have pressed for bringing in a uniform Bill. Because some emergency has arisen in the Bangalore University, they have brought this. Similar provision in section 11. There

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

is already a clause under the principal Act saying that if there is a vacancy on account of leave, illness or other causes definitely other arrangements can be made. The word 'other causes' have not been defined. Therefore I definitely say that sub-section (5) of section 11 is sufficient. If he says that it is not sufficient and an emergency has arisen, I would ask the Minister to see the Mysore University Act, Section 9 (6). What arrangement is made under the Mysore University Act, if the same emergency were to arise there? Does the Hon. Minister think that the Vice-Chancellor appointed for the Mysore University will be immortal and that such a situation will not arise?

MR. SPEAKER.—I think this Bill covers all the three universities.

SRI M. NAGAPPA.—Clause (2) may please be read, Sir. It states:

"In section 11, after sub-section (6) the following sub-section shall be added....."

It is only for Bangalore University and it will not apply to Mysore and Karnataka Universities. The amendment suggested in clause 3 pertains only to the Karnatak University Act and clause 4 pertains to the Mysore University Act. Therefore, this amendment will be applicable only to the Bangalore University Act, Mysore Act No. 26 of 1964. Therefore I request the Minister to explain while replying to my point why such an amendment has not been suggested to the Mysore University Act.

The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs stated yesterday that it is only by experience that amendments are brought. May I draw the attention of the Minister to this fact, *i. e.*, he has already come across an emergency in Bangalore University, and may I know whether he will consider what are the provisions in the Mysore and Karnatak University Acts? If such provisions are there in the Mysore Act and lacking in respect of other universities, was it not the duty of the Government to bring similar amendments? I submit with regret that the Government is not doing its duty properly. Therefore this is a very essential amendment and it may be accepted.

SRI L. SRIKANTAIAH,—The Chair was pleased to comment that the Bill covers all the three Universities. My hon. friend Sri Nagappa pointed out clause 2 of the Bill. Let us see clause 2, Amendment of Mysore Act No. 26 of 1964, it is applicable to the Bangalore University Act. There is a specific insertion of a sub-section in section 11 of the Act. It means the other University Acts, Karnatak University Act and the Mysore University Act, are excluded. Is it the intention of the Government that the amendment is brought in with reference to the Bangalore University only or shall we take it that it refers to all vacancies which arise either in the Karnatak University or Mysore University or Bangalore University? This clarification is necessary.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎನ್. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ನವರು ಏನು ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬಹುದೇ ಏನ ಅವರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅರು ತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡರೇಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನಮ್ಮದು.....

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Let the Government not accept six months. Let them take three years.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ.—ಅವರು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇಂತಿಷ್ಟೇ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲನಿಗದಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾ ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಷ್ಟೂ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಕೂಡ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗಳ್ಯಾರೂ ಹಾಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನಪಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎರ್. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಎರ್ಲಾ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎಂ. ಕೊಟ್ರಬಸಯ್ಯ ಸೋಗಿ.—ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಏನು ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರೋ ಅಂಥ ಅನುಮಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ವಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅನ್ವಯವಿದ್ದಕಾರಣ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ. I am not accepting the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"In item (i), in the proposed Sub-section (7) of Section 11, at page 2, line 9, after the words, 'during the period', the words 'which shall not exceed six calendar months' shall be inserted.

"In item (ii), for the proposed amendment, the following shall be substituted:—

'The Secretary to Government of Mysore, Department of Health and Municipal Administration'.

"In item (vii), after the words 'Five teachers', the words 'at least four of them being teachers in the affiliated colleges' shall be inserted."

That at page 2, after the proposed sub-section (7) of Section 11, the following new Sub-section shall be added :—

'(8) Notwithstanding anything contained in Sub-Section (7) the appointment of Vice-Chancellor, shall be made not later than six months from the date of such vacancy'."

The amendments were negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 3

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 3 do stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 4

SRI N. A. CHANNE GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move :

" That in item (ii), for the proposed amendment, the following shall be substituted :—

' The Secretary to Government, Health and Municipal Administration Department'."

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in item (ii), for the proposed amendment, the following shall be substituted:—

' The Secretary to Government, Health and Municipal Administration Department'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 4 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 5

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That clause 5 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, ETC.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

" That clause 1, the Long Title and the Enacting Formula do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Long Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri N. M. KOTRABASAIAH SOGI.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bangalore, Karnatak and Mysore Universities (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Bangalore, Karnatak and Mysore Universities (Amendment) Bill, 1969, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Commencing State Lotteries in the State

† Sri N. A. CHANNE GOWDA.—Sir, immediately after the question hour I rose to seek some information. I then said that I have got some reliable information regarding the decision of the Cabinet to introduce lottery in Mysore State. The finances of the Mysore State have already become a lottery matter. There was public agitation against lottery on the ground that it would poison the minds of the public. I want to know whether the Cabinet has decided about it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is better that the hon. Member gives notice of such matters so that I can pass it on to the Finance Minister for a considered reply.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare)—Sir, I do not know what exactly the hon. Member wants to know. Only a couple of days ago I have announced in this House itself that lottery will be introduced some time in October. If the Cabinet has considered anything, it is only the details of the scheme. I do not know what he wants to know further.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ರಾಟರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ಈಗ ಬೇಡ. ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗಲೇ ಏಕೆ ರಾಟರಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ರಾಟರಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

5-00 P.M.

ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸ್ಟ್ರೈಕ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೆ. ತಾವು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಡುಗರ ಅನ್ನ ನತ್ಯಾಗ್ರಹ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದಂತಹ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾದಂತಹ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ದಿನೇ ದಿನೇ ಬೆಳೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ, ಇವತ್ತು ಏನು ಇದ್ದರೂ,

(ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ನಂಜಪ್ಪ)

ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಕೂತು, ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಾಯ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಒಂದು ಶಾಂತ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ಅದರ ಬದಲು ಪ್ರತಿ ದಿನ ಪ್ರೆಶ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಏನಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕೂಡ ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಹುಡುಗರ ಮೆರವಣಿಗೆ ಹೊರಟಿದೆ. ಇದು ಪ್ರತಿ ದಿನ ನಡೆಯು ತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕೂತಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನ್ನ ಅರಿಕೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಡಿಫಿನೆಟ್ ಅಶ್ಯೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಶಾಂತಿ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Private Member's Bills

(i) Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969

Leave to introduce

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—I beg leave of the House to introduce the Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That leave be granted to the hon. member Sri L. Srikantaiah to introduce the Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Leave is grantad to introduce the Bill.

Sri L. SRIKANTAIAH.—I beg to introduce the Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Bill, 1969, is introduced.

(ii) Mysore Public Men Enquiries Bill, 1969

Motion to consider—Debate continued.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before the hon. Member Sri Nanje Gowda proceeds to offer his remarks, I wish to make one suggestion. I am sure he is interested in the speedy passage of the Bill through all its stages. In that case he should confine himself to the two points raised by the Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs and offer his remarks thereon, particularly the constitutional provision. General observations would not be of any use. I think the hon. Member Sri Channabasappa and other Members are also interested in speaking on this Bill. The two points